

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 599

CG 009 380

AUTHOR Hart, Roy H.
TITLE Problems of International Students Enrolled in Texas
Public Community Colleges as Perceived by
International Students and International Student
Advisors.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 41p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Foreign
Student Advisers; *Foreign Students; *Identification
Tests; Research Projects; *Student Problems
IDENTIFIERS *International Student Problem Inventory; ISPI

ABSTRACT

This study investigates student personnel problem perceptions of international students and international student advisors on selected community college campuses in Texas. The International Student Problem Inventory (ISPI) was administered to 220 international students and 37 international student advisors. Percentages were utilized to identify and compare problem perceptions of those taking the ISPI. Based on responses from the questions, some of the findings were: (1) international student advisors and international students perceived the most problems in the areas of the English language, financial aid, admissions and selection, and academic advising and records; (2) no significant differences were found between urban and rural student perceptions; (3) female students showed significantly different perceptions in several areas when compared with male students; (4) no significant differences were found between students on campus for varying lengths of time; and (5) no significant differences were found between married and single students. The author recommends that another study be undertaken to identify the existing and ideal background, role, and function of a model international student office in a public community college.
(Author/PC)

PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
ENROLLED IN TEXAS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES
AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADVISERS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rev. H. Hart, Ed.D.
2214 East 15th Street
Odessa, Texas 79761

FOREWARD

I would like to take this means of expressing my sincere appreciation to Odessa College for producing this summary of my research. The research was conducted with a belief in the benefits of international education; it is hoped that this summary will further the cause of international education in some small way.

Roy H. Hart, Ed.D.
Odessa, Texas
August, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1
TEXAS' RELEVANCE	4
QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED	5
DEFINITION OF TERMS USED	6
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	8
FINDINGS	10
International Student Advisers and International Students	10
Urban and Rural Students	11
Community Colleges Enrolling Twenty-five or Fewer International Students and Community Colleges Enrolling More Than Twenty-five International Students	14
Subgroups	15
Sex	15
Time on campus	15
Language	15
Marital Status	15
Area of interest	15
RECOMMENDATIONS	16
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

APPENDIX -

A. PART I: *General*

B. PART II: *Specific*

C. PART III: *Specific*

D. PART IV: *Specific*

E. PART V: *Specific*

F. PART VI: *Specific*

G. PART VII: *Specific*

H. PART VIII: *Specific*

I. PART IX: *Specific*

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. OVERALL COMPARISON: INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADVISERS AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS	12
2. OVERALL RANK: INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADVISERS AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS	13

PERCEPTION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS ENROLLED IN TEXAS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADVISERS

American higher education has become increasingly involved in international education in recent years (Epstein, 1967). For no segment of American higher education is this more true than for the community college. Cross-cultural contacts between people extend far back into the history of mankind. Becoming involved in international education quite early in their history, American institutions of higher learning have made significant contributions to the field. Cieslak (1955), Canter (1967), and Schulken (1968) have described these involvements and contributions in great detail.

The recent growth of the international student population in the United States has been tremendous. Wilson and Wilson (1965), Holland (1965, 1971, 1973), McInn (1964), and many others, have stressed this growth. Bowles (1964) pointed out that American commitment to international education constitutes one of the largest educational systems in the world. Schulken (1968) expressed the American philosophy well by stating, "Americans have consistently had a purpose in mind that went beyond that of education *per se*." It would seem altogether proper that the newest partner in American education, the community college, should participate in international activities as a full partner.

ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Two basic teaching patterns concern the community college and the international student as found in a review of the literature. One pattern

contends that the community college has not been accepted as a full partner on the international education scene; the other stresses the tremendous potential of the community college relative to international education.

Breuder (1972a) pointed out that, until recently, the community colleges have played only a minor role in international education. In an article by Matthewson (1968), the disparity between community college international student enrollment and community college involvement was pointed out. Epstein (1967:18) listed the absence of housing facilities, the lack of financial assistance, and the prestige of the four-year colleges as reasons why the two-year college has not fared well in direct comparisons with four-year colleges in the area of international education. He concluded by stating "... it is clear that the full potential of the junior college to play a constructive role in student exchange... is far from being realized."

From another point of view, many authorities spoke of the late sixties and early seventies as a time of tremendous growth and expansion for the community college and international education. Connolly (1967) characterized the community college as having all of the advantages of a four-year institution for the international student and lacking many of the disadvantages. Elliott (1969) listed the following advantages of the community college for the international student: (1) specialized two-year training programs, (2) ease of admission, (3) lower fees, and (4) favorable geographic location. Davis (1971) and Kerr (1973) echoed many of the same advantages.

Matthewson (1968) reported the results of a National Association for Foreign Student Affairs survey which indicated 67 percent of the 410 participating junior colleges enrolled international students. Grafton

(1970), referring to the same study, indicated that approximately 8 percent of all undergraduate international students were enrolled in community colleges. Ninety percent were full-time students; 80 percent were enrolled in transfer programs.

Miller (1971) found that approximately 10 percent of the international students in America attended a two-year institution. Although he found that about one-third of the two-year colleges having international students made no special provisions for them, he also found that 60 percent of the institutions were interested in getting information about improving or initiating programs for international students.

Holland (1973:10) reported that a total of 16,695, or about 12 percent of the international students included in the Institute of International Education's 1971-72 census, were enrolled in two-year institutions. He further stated: "There are some striking differences between foreign students in two-year colleges and the foreign student population as a whole." He reported that, for the second year in a row, a community college reported the largest international student enrollment among all American institutions of higher education responding to the survey. Miami-Dade Junior College reported 5,871 international students, or about 15 percent of the school's total enrollment.

Davis (1971:29-30) asked a basic question: "Why have foreign students in community colleges?" He answered by stating:

I have been able to identify at least five answers: (1) . . . because community colleges exist to educate people and foreign students are people who wish to be educated. (2) . . . in order to help educate our own American students. (3) . . . The faculty member who teaches foreign students learns something beyond what he would learn if he were teaching an American student, and this adds value to the institution and the enterprise. (4) . . . the impact they may be able to make on the community . . . (5) . . . we enhance the image of the United States in the world and in the particular countries and homes from which foreign students come.

Higbee (1961) answered the same question by pointing out the variety of contact and breadth of knowledge international students provide American students.

That the community college is likely to play an increasingly important role in international education programs in the future is shown in the following statement by Matthewson (1968:498):

I believe that two-year colleges are on the threshold, during the next decade, of a potential explosion from foreign student sources that will be one of the most dramatic and significant challenges to higher education, nationally and internationally, since the establishment in the United States of land-grant colleges over one hundred years ago and the G.I. student wave immediately following World War II.

In a similar vein, Elliott (1967) spoke of the certainty of significant roles for the two-year college in international education.

TEXAS' RELEVANCE

A review of the literature indicated that no in-depth studies have been conducted on the problems perceived by international students enrolled in Texas public community colleges. Furthermore, no studies were found pertaining to international student advisers' perceptions of international students' problems. Such a study would seem both timely and appropriate.

Among the fifty states, Texas ranked seventh in numbers of international students enrolled in the 1971-72 academic year. A total of 6,646 were reported. This amounted to 1.7 percent of the entire international student population in the United States (Holland, 1973:5). Among Texas' two-year institutions, public and private, a total of 849 international students were reported in twenty-five institutions (Holland, 1973:65-66).

While all are quick to applaud the benefits and champion the future

of international students in American higher education, it is possible that responsibilities to those same international students may have been overlooked by neglecting to identify and deal with the problems unique to them. Therefore it would seem to be a proper goal of education to identify the student personnel related problems of international students enrolled in community colleges in order to facilitate meeting the needs of all the people in the peoples' college.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

This study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the problems perceived by international students and international student advisers in participating Texas public community colleges as measured by the International Student Problem Inventory (ISPI)? Additionally, how do the perceptions compare?
2. Are the problems measured by the ISPI and perceived by international students enrolled in community colleges located in an urban environment significantly different from the problems perceived by international students enrolled in community colleges located in a rural environment?
3. Are the problems measured by the ISPI and perceived by international students enrolled in community colleges having twenty-five or fewer international students significantly different from the problems perceived by international students enrolled in community colleges having more than twenty-five international students enrolled?
4. Is there a significant difference in the problems perceived by certain subgroups of international students enrolled in participating

community colleges as measured by the ISPI? The subgroups included the following:

- a. Sex: male--female
- b. Time on Campus: less than twelve months--twelve months or longer
- c. Language Preference: English first preference--English not first preference
- d. Marital Status: Married--not married
- e. Area of interest: occupational (terminal) program--transfer program.

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

The following definitions are pertinent to the purpose of this study:

Community College: A two-year post-secondary educational institution.

For purposes of this study, Junior College, Community-Junior College, and Comprehensive Community College were considered synonymous and were used interchangeably (Breuder, 1972a:16).

Foreign Student Adviser (FSA): That person on the campus of participating Texas public community colleges who has been specifically designated by the president of the community college (or his designated representative) to work professionally with the international students in order to advise international students of institutional rules and regulations, government regulations and procedures, financial needs and responsibilities, employment, academic and social standards and customs, and institutional and local resources and opportunities. In this study the term International Student Adviser (ISA) was considered synonymous and was used interchangeably.

International Student: A student who comes to the United States for

educational purposes, but is not an immigrant, a resident of the United States, or a citizen of the United States. In this study the term Foreign Student was considered synonymous and was used interchangeably (Breuder, 1972a:16).

International Student Problem Inventory (ISPI): The instrument, as developed by Porter (1962) and modified by Breuder (1972a) and the present author, used in this study to identify problems of international students and subgroups of international students at participating Texas public community colleges. The ISPI was also used to identify foreign student advisers' perceptions of problems of foreign students in participating Texas public community colleges.

Participating Texas Public Community College: A Texas public community college which agreed to take part in this study and carried out its agreement by responding to the ISPI.

Problems: Any troubles, fears, concerns, worries, or frustrations which have been experienced by international students while enrolled in a community college in the United States; those affects identified by the ISPI (Breuder, 1972a:16).

Rural Environment: A city or town located outside one of the twenty-four Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of Texas.

Significant: Observations made by the investigator when a 10 percent difference exists between two compared groups. Not to be interpreted as being statistically significant (Breuder, 1972a:16).

Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA): A county with one or more cities of at least 50,000 population, plus any adjacent counties that are metropolitan in character and economically integrated with the central county (Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide: 1972-73, 1971:183).

Subgroups: International students divided into categories for comparative purposes (Breuder, 1972a:16).

Urban Environment: A city or town located within one of the twenty-four Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas of Texas.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The sample utilized in this study was composed of international students attending Texas public community colleges during the fall semester of 1973 who agreed to participate. Additionally, international student advisers at Texas public community colleges during the same semester who agreed to participate were included in the study.

A modification of the Michigan International Student Problem Inventory (MISPI) was used to identify perceived problems of international students in this study. Perceptions of international student advisers were also gathered through the use of the same instrument. The original MISPI was developed by Porter (1962) and later modified by Breuder (1972a). Permission was received by the present researcher from both Porter and Breuder to use the MISPI along with any modifications considered necessary. The basic MISPI was selected for use in this research because of its appropriateness. The MISPI was found to be a most comprehensive instrument for assisting in the identification of international students' student personnel related problems, and was therefore selected for use in this research. The MISPI is designed to present statements relative to problems encountered in eleven recognized areas of student personnel services. Each of the eleven areas contains twelve statements for a total of 132 statements.

In early September, 1973, an initial letter of contact was sent to the president of each of the fifty Texas public community colleges. The research project was briefly explained and each president was asked to commit his institution to participate by naming, on an enclosed self-addressed postal card, the international student adviser and by giving the approximate number of international students enrolled at that institution for the fall semester of 1973. Provision was also made on the postal card for the president to indicate that the institution did not wish to participate in the study.

In each case when a reply was received indicating willingness to participate, a packet of materials was mailed with a stamped return envelope included. The packet contained the following materials: a cover letter to the addressee explaining the purposes of the study and the procedure to be followed; enough copies of the ISPI for each international student in that institution to have one; a letter to the international student adviser in a separate envelope asking him to complete an ISPI from the point of view of an international student on his campus at that particular point in time; and a specially marked copy of the ISPI for the international student adviser. Upon receipt of the materials from the various community colleges by the researcher, a personal letter was sent to the international student adviser thanking him for his participation and the participation of the students on his campus and informing him of a proposed timetable concerning the reporting of the final results of the study. Follow-up correspondence was sent where required to those colleges delinquent in returning the materials.

Of the fifty original contacts, 100 percent replied. Four community colleges indicated that they did not then, nor did they expect to in the future, enroll international students. Of the remaining forty-six

institutions, thirty-six agreed to participate. Of this sample, thirty (83 percent) returned a total of 250 ISPI's. Six institutions which had originally agreed to participate failed to return materials despite follow-up activities. Of the thirty, three returned ISPI's completed by international student advisers only. In each case, it was verified by the researcher that the institution was temporarily without international students. In none of the three institutions was it determined that the institution intended to exclude international students from its student body. Thus, 220 international students, representing twenty-seven campuses, and 30 international student advisers, representing thirty campuses, were included in this study.

Responses to the ISPI were coded and the data were processed by the East Texas State University computer center. Percentages were utilized to identify and compare problems perceived by Texas public community college international students and international student advisers. These data were utilized to answer the research questions.

FINDINGS

The information in this section deals with the findings of the study as they relate to the previously mentioned research questions.

International Student Advisers and International Students

The data which dealt with the first research question indicated that there were eight subscales which contained differences of perceptions between international student advisers and international students great enough to be considered significant. These were (from greatest to least) academic advising and records, admissions and selection, social-personal,

student activities, English language, financial aid, orientation services, and placement services. In each of the eight cases, it was found that the international student advisers perceived problems to a greater degree than did the international students (Table 1).

It is interesting to note that the four subscales reflecting the greatest problem perceptions by both students and advisers were identical (Table 2). They were (from greatest to least) English language, financial aid, admissions and selection, and academic advising and records. The four subscales reflecting the least problem perceptions for advisers were (from greatest to least) living-dining, orientation services, religious services, and health services. For students the four least were (from greatest to least) orientation services, student activities, health services, and religious services.

Urban and Rural Students

The second question of the study dealt with differences of perceptions of problems between international students enrolled in urban and rural community colleges. The data revealed no significant differences in any of the eleven subscales between these two groups.

The three subscales reflecting the greatest problem perceptions by both groups of students were identical. They were (from greatest to least) English language, financial aid, and admissions and selection. The three subscales reflecting the least problem perceptions for international students enrolled in urban community colleges were (from greatest to least) orientation services, health services, and religious services. For students enrolled in rural community colleges, the three least were (from greatest to least) orientation services, living-dining, and religious services.

Table 1
OVERALL COMPARISON
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADVISERS AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
*Admissions & Selection	61.6											
	42.9											
*Orientation Services	47.2											
	36.4											
*Academic Advising & Records	61.1											
	42.2											
*Social-Personal	54.4											
	37.1											
Living-Dining	47.5											
	38.1											
Health Services	32.5											
	30.9											
Religious Services	34.5											
	25.7											
*English Language	75.4											
	62.7											
*Student Activities	52.2											
	36.1											
*Financial Aid	63.4											
	51.8											
*Placement Services	52.2											
	42.0											

*A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

**In each case, figures for advisers appear first.

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC RANKINGS

Rank

1. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

2. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

3. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

4. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

5. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

6. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

7. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

8. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

9. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

10. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

11. ~~UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO~~

Community Colleges Enrolling Twenty-five or Fewer International Students and Community Colleges
Enrolling More Than Twenty-five International Students

The third research question dealt with students attending community colleges enrolling twenty-five or fewer international students and students attending community colleges enrolling more than twenty-five international students. The data revealed one subscale which was significantly different between the two groups of students. International students attending community colleges enrolling twenty-five or fewer international students perceived significantly greater problems in the subscale English language than did international students attending community colleges enrolling more than twenty-five international students.

The three subscales reflecting the greatest problem perceptions by students attending community colleges enrolling twenty-five or fewer international students were (from greatest to least) English language, financial aid, and admissions and selection. For students attending community colleges enrolling more than twenty-five international students, the three subscales reflecting the greatest problem perceptions were (from greatest to least) English language, financial aid, and placement services.

The three subscales reflecting the least problem perceptions for students attending community colleges enrolling twenty-five or fewer international students were (from greatest to least) orientation services, health services, and religious services. For students attending community colleges enrolling more than twenty-five international students, the three least problem perceptions were (from greatest to least) student activities, health services, and religious services.

Subgroups

The last research question dealt with the problems perceived by certain subgroups of international students. The subgroups were based upon sex, time on campus, language preference, marital status, and area of interest.

Sex. Within the subgroup "sex," four subscales were found to be significantly different. They were (from greatest to least) academic advising and records, health services, English language, and social-personal. In all four subscales, female international students perceived greater problems than did male international students.

Time on campus. Within the subgroup "time on campus," none of the eleven subscales was found to be significantly different between the two groups of students. However, in seven subscales, students who had been on campus twelve months or more perceived greater problems than did those students who had been on campus less than twelve months.

Language. Within the subgroup "language preference," two subscales were found to be significantly different. They were (from greatest to least) English language and religious services. In both cases, students listing a language other than English as first preference perceived greater problems than did students whose language of first preference was English.

Marital status. Within the subgroup "marital status," none of the eleven subscales was found to be significantly different between the two groups of students. However, in nine subscales, students who were not married perceived greater problems than did those students who were married.

Area of interest. Within the subgroup "area of interest," none of the eleven subscales was found to be significantly different between the two groups of students. However, in nine of the eleven subscales, students

enrolled in occupational (terminal) programs perceived greater problems than did those students enrolled in transfer programs. Transfer oriented students perceived greater problems only in the financial aid and health services subscales.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has demonstrated that international student advisers and international students in participating Texas public community colleges do perceive problems in student personnel related areas as measured by the International Student Problem Inventory. Many of the perceived problems relate to the areas of English language, financial aid, admissions and selection, and academic advising and records. The following recommendations are therefore offered with the hope that they will serve as a beginning rather than an ending:

1. Action should be taken to insure that all international students admitted to the community college possess definite English language abilities. It is recommended that the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), or other equivalent test of English competency, be required for admission. Additionally, special academic sections of English should be available each semester for those speaking English as a second language. Professional personal counseling should be utilized along with student self-evaluation, teacher evaluation, and past grade point averages in order to determine the need for these courses on an individual basis.

2. Every possible avenue of financial assistance should be explored in order to help reduce financial hardships existing among international students. This could include a realistic assessment of the amount of money needed by the typical international student during the course of a semester

as well as developing short term loan funds for emergency use, scholarship funds, and community based financial assistance.

3. Community colleges should provide the training necessary for a specific staff member or members to acquire proficiency in the evaluation of transcripts and educational records of international students or establish professional relationships with organizations which are equipped to make such evaluations in order to alleviate as many problems as possible related to the admission and selection process. Additionally, it is recommended that the community college make its admission policies known to the prospective international student in very clear concise terms beginning with the initial correspondence or contact.

4. Intake counseling and orientation experiences should be provided relative to the academic advising and records functions which have been specifically designed for the international students. A definite on-going program of academic advising is an essential element in the process.

5. Since this is the first known study designed to gather student personnel related problem perceptions from both international student advisers and international students, it is recommended that it be replicated in other states among public community colleges.

6. Since very little demographic data were gathered in the course of this study relative to the role and function of the international student adviser in Texas public community colleges, it is recommended that a study be undertaken to identify the existing and ideal background, role, and function of a model international student office in a public community college.

Although it is impossible to list all the desirable recommendations evolving from a study such as this, it is felt that the preceding are typical of the kinds of concerns that are germane to the community college

and its involvement with international education. Without question the community college has a great deal to offer the international student; likewise the international student has a great deal to offer the community college.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS AND REPORTS

Cieslak, Edward C. 1955. The Foreign Student in American Colleges. Detroit: Wayne State University.

Deutsch, Steven E. 1970. International Education and Exchange: A Sociological Analysis. Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve University.

DuBois, Cora A. 1956. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Gaither, Gerald H., and Anthony C. Griffin. 1971. The International Student at the University of Tennessee. Knoxville: Office of Institutional Research, University of Tennessee.

Higbee, Homer D. 1961. The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Universities and Colleges. East Lansing: Institute of Research on University Overseas Programs. Michigan State University.

..... "Research on Foreign Graduate Students: A Review of the Literature." The Foreign Graduate Student: Priorities for Research and Action. Colloquim. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 8-12.

Holland, Kenneth. 1964. "The Foreign Student in the United States." In Higher Education in the United States. Edited by Allan M. Cartter. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

..... 1965. Open Doors 1965: Report on International Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education.

..... 1971. Open Doors 1971: Report on International Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education.

..... 1973. Open Doors 1972: Report on International Exchange. New York: Institute of International Education.

Kerr, Lornie. 1973. Foreign Students in the Community-Junior College. Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. 1970. Guidelines: Responsibilities and Standards in Work With Foreign Students. Field Service Publication G-1. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Rashdall, Hastings. 1936. "The University and the Town." In The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, Vol. III. Edited by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rising, M. N., and B. M. Copp. 1968. Adjustment Experiences of Non-Immigrant Foreign Students at the University of Rochester, 1967-68. Rochester: University of Rochester.

Sanders, Irwin F. 1965. The Professional Education of Students from Other Lands. New York: Council on Social Work Education.

Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide: 1972-1973. 1971. Dallas, Texas: A. H. Belo Corporation.

Toffler, Alvin. 1970. Future Shock. New York: Random House, Inc.

Wilson, Howard L., and Florence H. Wilson. 1963. American Higher Education and World Affairs. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

B. PERIODICALS

Arum, Stephen. Fall, 1969. "International Matchmaker Extraordinaire," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 5:69-75.

Bowles, Frank. Winter, 1964. "American Responsibilities in International Education," Educational Record, 45:19-26.

Canter, Jacob. February, 1967. "Our Common Challenge in International Education," Junior College Journal, 37:14-16.

Laquelin, Howard J. Winter, 1970. "Education for an Emerging Profession," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 5:44-65.

Carpenter, Edward L. Spring, 1969. "Roles of the Foreign Student Adviser," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 4:38-42.

Connolly, John J. February, 1967. "International Students and the Two-Year College," Junior College Journal, 37:20-21.

Davis, James M. Fall, 1971. "Foreign Students in the Two-Year College," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 7:25-32.

Domingues, Patricia M. Winter, 1970. "Student Personnel Services for International Students," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 55:83-89.

Donahue, Francis. September, 1970. "The International Student: His Six Roles," The Clearing House, 45:51-55.

Eddy, John. May, 1972. "Factors and Guidelines in Foreign Student Guidance," Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:252-54.

Elliott, F. George. October, 1969. "The Dilemma of Foreign Student Admissions," Junior College Journal, 40:17-20.

Epstein, Harold. February, 1967. "Where Do Junior Colleges Fit In?" Junior College Journal, 37:17-19.

Frankel, Charles. March, 1966. "New Initiatives in International Education," Journal of Higher Education, 37:121-28.

Grafton, Clive L. March, 1970. "Foreign Student Patterns in American Community Colleges," Junior College Journal, 40:32-33.

Hagey, A. R., and Joan Hagey. March, 1972. "The International Student and the Junior College: Academic and Social Needs," Journal of College Student Personnel, 13:140-44.

Jenkins, Hugh M. Spring, 1973. "NAFSA and the Student Abroad: A Silver Anniversary Review," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 8:1-13.

Johnson, Alan W. Spring, 1971. "Costs of International Education: Who Pays?," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 6:32-43.

Klein, Majorie, and others. Winter, 1971. "The Foreign Student Adaption Program," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 6:77-90.

Klinger, M. Robert. Summer, 1967. "Foreign Student Adviser: A Necessary Profession," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 3:21-27.

McCann, Carolyn J. Summer, 1964. "Major Issues in Advising Foreign Students: A Review," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 28:172-78.

Matthewson, Douglas E. Summer, 1968. "The International Student in the Junior College," College and University, 43:497-512.

Miller, Merrill G. October, 1971. "The International Dimension of the Community College," National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 9:148-54.

Moore, Forrest G. Summer, 1970. "International Education in the Seventies: Revolution or Turmoil on the Campus," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 6:34-47.

Newson, C. V. May, 1961. "The Foreign Student Needs More Attention," College and University Business, 50:41-46.

Peterson, James., and Martin H. Neumeyer. 1948. "Problems of Foreign Students," Sociology and Social Research, 32:787-92.

Shannon, William G. May, 1971. "Emphasis: International Project Begins," Junior College Journal, 11:5.

Sjogren, Clifford. May, 1970. "Should We Continue to Help Foreign Students?," National Association of College Admissions Counselors Journal, 15:22-24.

Tanenhaus, Joseph, and Sidney G. Roth. December, 1962. "Non-Immigrant Foreign Students: A Survey of Their Needs and Interests," The Journal of Experimental Education, 31:173-76.

Walker, Bill R., and John D. Alcorn. May 19, 1968. "Critical Requirements of Foreign Student Advisers," Journal of College Student Personnel, 9:190-92.

Walton, Barbara J. Winter, 1971. "Research on Foreign Graduate Students," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 6:17-29.

C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Baptista, Sam J. 1953. "A Study of the Problems and Needs of Foreign Students Enrolled at Florida State University." Unpublished Master's thesis, The Florida State University.

Breuder, Robert L. 1972a. "Identified Problems of International Students Enrolled in Public Junior Colleges in Florida." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The Florida State University.

September, 1972b. "Identified Problems of International Students Enrolled in Public Junior Colleges in Florida." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The Florida State University. Dissertation Abstracts, 33:982-A.

Elliott, Frederick G. August, 1967. "Foreign Student Programs in Selected Public California Junior Colleges: An Analysis of Adminstrative Policies and Practices." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles. Dissertation Abstracts, 28A:388-A.

Hagey, A. R. 1968. "Academic and Social Adjustment of Middle Eastern Students Attending Oregon Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Oregon.

Mograbi, Kamel M. 1966. "An Analysis of Factors That Influence the Degree of Success or Failure of Foreign Students at Texas A & M University," Unpublished Master's thesis, Texas A & M University.

Porter, John W. 1962. "The Development of an Inventory to Determine the Problems of Foreign Students." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Michigan State University.

April, 1963. "The Development of an Inventory to Determine the Problems of Foreign Students." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Michigan State University. Dissertation Abstracts, 23:3783-84.

Santos, Antusa P. March, 1960. "A Study of the Problems Faced by Foreign Students at Indiana University with Implications for Action." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Indiana State University. Dissertation Abstracts, 20:3580.

Schulken, Emma Walker. 1968. "A History of Foreign Students in American Higher Education from Its Colonial Beginnings to the Present." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The Florida State University.

Zain, Elias Khalil. 1965. "A Study of the Academic and Personal-Social Difficulties Encountered by a Select Group of Foreign Students at the University of Oregon." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Oregon.

_____. February, 1966. "A Study of the Academic and Personal-Social Difficulties Encountered by a Select Group of Foreign Students at the University of Oregon." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Oregon. Dissertation Abstracts, 26:4352.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A. PARTICIPATING TEXAS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

<u>College</u>	<u>Location</u>
Cisco Junior College	Cisco, Texas
College of the Mainland	Texas City, Texas
Eastfield College	Mesquite, Texas
El Centro College	Dallas, Texas
Galveston Community College	Galveston, Texas
Henderson County College	Athens, Texas
Hill Junior College	Hillsboro, Texas
Houston Community College	Houston, Texas
Howard County Junior College	Big Spring, Texas
Laredo Junior College	Laredo, Texas
Lee College	Baytown, Texas
McLennan Community College	Waco, Texas
Midland College	Midland, Texas
Mountainview College	Dallas, Texas
Navarro Junior College	Corsicana, Texas
Odessa College	Odessa, Texas
Panola College	Carthage, Texas
Paris Junior College	Paris, Texas
Ranger Junior College	Ranger, Texas
San Antonio College	San Antonio, Texas
South Plains College	Levelland, Texas
Southwest Texas Junior College	Uvalde, Texas
Tarrant County Junior College South Campus	Fort Worth, Texas
Temple Junior College	Temple, Texas

APPENDIX A.--CONTINUED

<u>College</u>	<u>Location</u>
Tyler Junior College	Tyler, Texas
Vernon Regional Junior College	Vernon, Texas
Victoria College	Victoria, Texas
Weatherford College	Weatherford, Texas
Western Texas College	Synder, Texas
Wharton County Junior College	Wharton, Texas

APPENDIX B. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ADVISER DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<u>Classification</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Urban	53.3											
Rural	46.7											
>25	30.0											
≤ 25	70.0											
Male	60.0											
Female	40.0											
Complete picture?												
Yes	46.7											
No	6.7											
N/R	6.7											

APPENDIX C. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

<u>Classification</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Age												
16-20	20.5	—										
21-25	71.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
26-30	4.1	—										
31-35	0.5	—										
36-40	0.0											
41+	0.0											
N/R	3.2	—										
Freshman	69.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sophomore	29.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
N/R	1.4	—										
Major												
Nat'l. Sci.	11.4	—										
Social Sci.	4.1	—										
Humanities	3.2	—										
Business	22.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Engineering	37.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	20.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
N/R	0.5	—										
Urban	44.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	55.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
> 25	62.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
≤ 25	37.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Male	85.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Female	14.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
< 12 mo.	69.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
≥ 12 mo.	29.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

APPENDIX C.--CONTINUED

<u>Classification</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
E F P	2.7	—										
E N F P	97.3	—————										
Married	12.3	————										
Not Married	87.3	—————										
N/R	0.5	—										
Occupational	13.2	————										
Transfer	81.8	—————										
N/R	5.0	—										
Complete Picture?												
Yes	67.7	—————										
No	21.8	————										
N/R	10.5	—										

APPENDIX D. URBAN AND RURAL INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions and Selection	** 43.6	_____										
	42.3	_____										
Orientation Services	33.8	_____										
	35.5	_____										
Academic Advising & Records	43.0	_____										
	41.6	_____										
Social-Personal	34.2	_____										
	39.3	_____										
Living-Dining	36.1	_____										
	39.4	_____										
Health Services	26.2	_____										
	34.4	_____										
Religious Services	24.2	_____										
	26.5	_____										
English Language	61.2	_____										
	63.7	_____										
Student Activities	34.7	_____										
	37.2	_____										
Financial Aid	52.5	_____										
	51.2	_____										
Placement Services	41.9	_____										
	41.9	_____										

*A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

**In each case, figures for urban international students appear first.

APPENDIX E. TWENTY-FIVE OR FEWER AND MORE THAN TWENTY-FIVE
INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions & Selection	** 46.0	_____										
	41.4	_____										
Orientation Services	36.1	_____										
	40.1	_____										
Academic Advising & Records	44.0	_____										
	41.0	_____										
Social-Personal	40.6	_____										
	34.9	_____										
Living-Dining	39.9	_____										
	36.0	_____										
Health Services	33.9	_____										
	29.0	_____										
Religious Services	28.8	_____										
	23.5	_____										
*English Language	70.6	_____										
	57.8	_____										
Student Activities	41.3	_____										
	32.9	_____										
Financial Aid	54.2	_____										
	50.4	_____										
Placement Services	44.3	_____										
	50.4	_____										

* A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

** In each case, figures for community colleges enrolling twenty-five or fewer international students appear first.

APPENDIX F. MALE AND FEMALE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions & Selection	** 41.9	_____										
	48.8	_____										
Orientation Services	33.6	_____										
	41.4	_____										
* Academic Advising & Records	40.3	_____										
	53.4	_____										
* Social-Personal	34.8	_____										
	44.9	_____										
Living-Dining	37.1	_____										
	42.2	_____										
* Health Services	29.2	_____										
	40.6	_____										
Religious Services	24.7	_____										
	30.5	_____										
* English Language	61.1	_____										
	71.6	_____										
Student Activities	34.7	_____										
	44.3	_____										
Financial Aid	51.6	_____										
	55.7	_____										
Placement Services	41.0	_____										
	48.2	_____										

* A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

** In each case, figures for male international students appear first.

APPENDIX G. LESS THAN TWELVE MONTHS AND TWELVE MONTHS OR MORE

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions & Selection	** 43.9	_____										
	40.8	_____										
Orientation Services	34.6	_____										
	34.9	_____										
Academic Advising & Records	40.8	_____										
	45.7	_____										
Social-Personal	36.9	_____										
	37.7	_____										
Living-Dining	38.7	_____										
	36.0	_____										
Health Services	30.2	_____										
	32.6	_____										
Religious Services	25.3	_____										
	25.7	_____										
English Language	64.4	_____										
	59.0	_____										
Student Activities	36.6	_____										
	34.8	_____										
Financial Aid	51.5	_____										
	52.2	_____										
Placement Services	40.6	_____										
	45.8	_____										

* A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

** In each case, figures for international students on campus less than twelve months appear first.

APPENDIX H. ENGLISH FIRST PREFERENCE AND ENGLISH NOT FIRST PREFERENCE

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions & Selection	**41.6	_____										
	42.9	_____										
Orientation Services	30.6	_____										
	34.8	_____										
Academic Advising & Records	33.3	_____										
	42.4	_____										
Social-Personal	41.7	_____										
	36.9	_____										
Living-Dining	36.1	_____										
	37.9	_____										
Health Services	25.0	_____										
	31.0	_____										
*Religious Services	15.3	_____										
	25.7	_____										
*English Language	32.0	_____										
	63.5	_____										
Student Activities	30.6	_____										
	36.2	_____										
Financial Aid	54.2	_____										
	51.8	_____										
Placement Services	48.6	_____										
	41.9	_____										

* A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

** In each case, figures for international students listing English as their first language preference appear first.

APPENDIX I. MARRIED AND NOT MARRIED INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions & Selection	** 40.4	_____										
	42.2	_____										
Orientation Services	31.8	_____										
	35.1	_____										
Academic Advising & Records	38.9	_____										
	42.8	_____										
Social-Personal	33.7	_____										
	37.5	_____										
Living-Dining	38.6	_____										
	37.8	_____										
Health Services	25.0	_____										
	31.6	_____										
Religious Services	21.2	_____										
	25.9	_____										
English Language	59.9	_____										
	63.2	_____										
Student Activities	32.4	_____										
	36.6	_____										
Financial Aid	52.2	_____										
	51.7	_____										
Placement Services	39.2	_____										
	42.5	_____										

* A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

** In each case, figures for married international students appear first.

APPENDIX J. OCCUPATIONAL AND TRANSFER

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>%</u>	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
Admissions & Selection	** 45.4 42.5	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Orientation Services	39.3 34.6	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Academic Advising & Records	45.7 41.7	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Social-Personal	37.4 37.1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Living-Dining	39.3 37.7	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Health Services	26.1 31.3	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Religious Services	27.6 25.8	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
English Language	66.7 62.3	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Activities	41.4 35.1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Financial Aid	42.6 51.6	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Placement Services	45.8 41.2	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*A 10 percent difference in perception is significant.

**In each case, figures for occupational students appear first.